

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 OAKLAND DIVISION
11

12 Michael HILL,

13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 Kevin CHAPPELL, Acting Warden of
16 San Quentin State Prison,¹

17 Respondent.

Case Number 4-94-cv-641-CW

DEATH-PENALTY CASE

ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S
MOTION FOR DISCOVERY

[Doc. No. 327]

18 Petitioner moves to inspect the files of the Alameda County
19 District Attorney and the Oakland Police Department that are
20 relevant to his case and that have not been produced already.
21 (Doc. No. 327.) Petitioner relies on Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S.
22 83 (1963), and its progeny. (Id. at 2.) Respondent opposes the
23 motion. (Doc. No. 329.)

24 The Court previously found good cause for, and ordered, the
25 discovery that Petitioner currently seeks. (Doc. No. 97.)
26 However, the Court of Appeals held that discovery in this action
27

28 ¹ Kevin Chappell is automatically substituted for his predecessor
as Respondent pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d).

1 was premature at that time because Petitioner had not yet filed a
2 federal habeas petition. Accordingly, the Court of Appeals
3 "issue[d] a writ of mandamus (1) vacating the district court's
4 order, and (2) prohibiting the issuance of any discovery orders
5 until Hill files a petition for writ of habeas corpus in federal
6 court presenting only exhausted claims." Calderon v. U.S. Dist.
7 Ct. N.D. Cal. (Hill), 120 F.3d 927, 928 (9th Cir. 1997).

8 Petitioner subsequently initiated exhaustion proceedings in
9 the Supreme Court of California. During those proceedings, he
10 twice sought the discovery at issue. Both times, the state
11 supreme court denied Petitioner's discovery motions for lack of
12 jurisdiction. (Doc. No. 329-1 at 3 (citing People v. Gonzalez,
13 800 P.2d 1159, 1204-05 (Cal. 1990)).)

14 Following the completion of exhaustion proceedings, this
15 Court ordered Petitioner to litigate discovery in Alameda
16 Superior Court pursuant to In re Steele, 85 P.3d 444 (Cal. 2004).
17 (Doc. No. 254 at 1.) The superior court denied Petitioner's
18 Steele request based not on the record in the case but because
19 state courts are short-staffed in contrast to federal courts.
20 (Doc. No. 327-3 at 5-7.)

21 There is no basis for the Court to reconsider its previous
22 finding of good cause for the discovery Petitioner seeks, as the
23 factual basis for that finding has not materially changed,² and
24 there has been no material change in the relevant law, see
25 Gonzalez v. Wong, 667 F.3d 965 (9th Cir. 2011). Cf. Civ. L.R. 7-

26
27 ² Petitioner has developed additional relevant evidence. (e.g.,
28 Doc. No. 327-4 at 2 (prosecutor's letter promising not to prosecute
Michael McCray, who Petitioner claimed had committed the murders of
which Petitioner was convicted).)

1 9(b). In addition, Petitioner has satisfied the condition that
2 the Court of Appeals established for the discovery, as he has
3 filed a federal habeas petition, (Doc. No. 193), that presents
4 only exhausted claims, (see Doc. No. 259 at 21). Accordingly,
5 Petitioner's discovery motion, (Doc. No. 327), is granted.

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 DATED: 5/29/2012



CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge